This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 29, 2009. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, and 31-36 are in the application, of which claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is believed to be added herein. Changes to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example, original paragraphs [07], [16], [54], and [70].

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, regarding the feature of "an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop," the Office Action alleges that since "paragraph 0048 of the instant application lists over 12 different operating systems to which the invention applies, many of which are non Microsoft-Windows based operating systems," one skilled in the art would not have been conveyed the notion that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time of the filing.

Without conceding the correctness of this rejection, and to expedite the prosecution of this Application, claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are amended herein to replace "an operating system" with "a Microsoft® Widows® operating system." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 7, 17, 21, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,295,556 (Falcon) in view of U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0003371 (Coulthard) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,557 (Martinez); Claims 3, 9, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Martinez, and U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0091850 (Perholtz); Claims 4, 10, 25, 27, 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Martinez, and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,709 (Beadle); Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Martinez and U.S. Patent No. 7,181,524 (Lele); Claims 6, 12, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Martinez, and U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0183831 (Ritchy); Claims 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard, Martinez, Beadle and Lele. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is directed to a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, comprising: a desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon for a first application, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device, wherein a user can either select the first connection icon or an active area on the desktop, wherein selecting the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection, wherein selecting the active area allows a new connection window to appear and, upon designating a new connection, allows a second connection icon for a second application to be displayed directly on the desktop, wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different from the first connection, between the remote computing device and a second local computing device, wherein the first application is different from the second application, wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, wherein the user interface comprises a software feature configured to allow the user to select and modify a connection icon from the desktop of the remote computing

device to alter a connection of the connection icon, and wherein the remote computing device includes a Microsoft® Widows® operating system which does not allow the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user to alter the connection of the connection icon in absence of the software feature.

The applied references are not understood to disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1, particularly with respect to at least the following features in which the user interface comprises a software feature configured to allow a user to select and modify a connection icon from the desktop of the remote computing device to alter a connection of the connection icon, and wherein the remote computing device includes a Microsoft® Widows® operating system which does not allow the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user to alter the connection of the connection icon in absence of the software feature, as recited in claim 1.

By way of illustration, without limiting the scope of the claims, the instant application states in paragraph [0007], "[t]he original desktop shell for the Microsoft® Windows® family of operating systems, known as Microsoft® Explorer, does not allow a user to add, edit or delete connections between a remote computing device and a local computing device from the desktop shell. For instance, users of application such as Citrix®, which operates on the Microsoft® CE operating system must use a specialized connection manager interface to administer each connection, and existing connections cannot be displayed on the desktop." (Emphasis added).

As described in paragraph [0016] of the instant application, the improved user interface of the claimed subject matter provides, for example, "additional features designed around the management of a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device" and addresses shortcomings of conventional user interfaces including the above-identified shortcomings relating to the user being unable to add, edit, or delete connections.

Turning to the applied references, Falcon discloses a method and system for configuring computers to connect to networks using network connection objects. See Falcon, Abstract. To facilitate the use of the connection objects, a connection manager 78 interfaces with the user through a folder 96 and manages the connection objects. Network connections generally appear

- 12 -

as icons in the <u>connection folder</u> 96. See Falcon, FIGS. 5 and 6; col. 6:29-33. These icons are <u>not</u> and <u>cannot be displayed directly on the desktop</u>. Falcon's icons are in a connection folder 96 in FIG. 6, <u>not directly on the desktop</u>. In fact, folder 96 of FIG. 6 also displays an "X" on the top right corner because folder 96 appears as a window, and not as a desktop.

In column 6, lines 29-34, Falcon states: "To facilitate the use of the connection objects, as shown in FIG. 5, a connection manager 78 interfaces with the user through a folder 96 and manages the connection objects $76_1 - 76_n$." Accordingly, Falcon places the connection objects inside a folder (not on the desktop) in order to manage the connection objects. This is because the <u>connection objects cannot be managed from the desktop</u> of Falcon. Therefore, Falcon fails to disclose the above-identified software feature as claimed.

The above-identified deficiency of Falcon is not cured by Coulthard. While Coulthard discloses three connections 1111, 1112 and 1113 (see FIG. 11), Coulthard is not seen to disclose or suggest that connection icons can be selected and modified from the desktop by a user to alter a connection of the connection icon. More particularly, Coulthard is not seen to disclose or suggest that the user interface comprises a software feature configured to allow the user to select and modify a connection icon from the desktop of the remote computing device to alter a connection of the connection icon, and wherein the remote computing device includes a Microsoft® Widows® operating system which does not allow the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user to alter the connection of the connection icon in absence of the software feature.

Martinez does not remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Falcon or Coulthard. The Office Action cites Martinez as disclosing the feature wherein "the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop." Office Action, p.8. In particular, the Office Action refers to activity icons 314 and 316 on LCD display 124 of Martinez as disclosing "non-modifiable connection icons." See Office Action, p.8. The Office Action also alleges that Martinez' "booting process of the device using ROM based BIOS" corresponds to "non Microsoft-Window based operating system." See id.

- 13 -

Without addressing or conceding the correctness of the above-noted characterization of the reference in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that Martinez' booting process and activity icons 314 and 316 do not disclose or suggest that (i) a remote computing device includes a Microsoft® Widows® operating system which does <u>not</u> allow <u>a connection icon</u> to be <u>modified from the desktop</u> by a user to alter the connection of the connection icon; yet (ii) a user interface comprises a software feature configured to allow the user to select and <u>modify the connection icon (that was not modifiable) from the desktop</u> of the remote computing device to alter a connection of the connection icon.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicant submits that Falcon, Coulthard and Martinez, either alone or in combination, are not understood to disclose, teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1. The Office Action does not identify aspects of the other cited references that remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies. Therefore, the claimed software features would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing without the benefit of impermissible hindsight gleaned from the disclosure of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Similar arguments apply to other independent claims 7, 17, and 21.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically

stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be contacted at the address and telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500   **Please recognize our Customer No. 31824**
Irvine, CA 92612-7108   **as our correspondence address.**
Phone: 949.851.0633 SKL:lmt
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: December 22, 2009